



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## VI.—THE *COMEDIAS* OF DIEGO XIMÉNEZ DE ENCISO.

### I.

It is usually a safe principle to abide by the judgment of time and leave a forgotten writer in the oblivion to which his nation consigns him. With the Spanish playwrights of the seventeenth century, however, the rule may be said to offer an exception by reason of the fact that the merciless excess of dramas forced into neglect, with what was mediocre, much that in itself was excellent and which might, under more favorable circumstances, have stood the test of time. The works of no one have suffered more in this respect than those of Ximénez de Enciso. Though he has from time to time been deemed worthy of honorable mention, it is not possible to say that he has ever been given the just measure of praise to which a closer view of what remains from his pen would entitle him. In his own day he enjoyed considerable fame, as the frequent mention of his achievement by contemporaries would go to show, but for the two and a half centuries which have passed since then, he has shared the fate of the majority of Spanish playwrights whose works have been consigned to an undeserved oblivion.

First of all, what is the verdict of his contemporaries? A search for matter of value in such works as Lope de Vega's *Laurel de Apolo*, Cervantes' *Viaje del Parnaso*, or Montalbán's *Para Todos*, where some judgment on writers of the *siglo de oro* is passed, reminds one very often of a search "for two grains of wheat hid in two bushels of chaff," in which the trouble of the investigation finds no compensation in the value of the discovery. One is impressed at every turn by the poor character of the evidence in these perfunctory panegyrics on contemporaries. These rosters of the battalions of the

pen indiscriminately mingle genius and hack ; many a name is sounded with a flourish whose owner, for all we know of him, might never have penned a line.

Enciso has fared better than others in this respect, however, for almost every mention of him has a note of genuine appreciation. Lope de Vega speaks of him on three separate occasions, the first being in his epic, the *Jerusalén Conquistada*, 1605.<sup>1</sup> Mention is therein made of a group of Sevillans, among them being Arguijo, Pacheco, Herrera, Rioja, poets and painters whom Lope calls *his friends*. Third in the list stands the name of Enciso. Whether any intimacy really existed between the master past forty and the young man just in his twenty-first year, will probably always remain a matter of speculation. The important fact is that Enciso is found by the side of men of established fame. Lope praises his *dulce lyra*, his *sweet lyric gift*, and we must infer that he had reference to that class of the poet's productions represented by his Odes to Winter and to Spring, which are the only remnants from his pen, outside of the drama, which have come down to us. Sixteen years later (1621) in describing his garden<sup>2</sup> adorned with images of famous men, among whom stands our writer, Lope refers to the *sonorous, distinguished, and artless* style of Enciso. This may be intended to characterize the dramatist Enciso, who, being at that time thirty-six years old, must already have written many of his best plays. By 1630, in the *Laurel de Apolo*,<sup>3</sup> Enciso is called the author of *many works, excellently written*, and Lope's praise, though somewhat excessive, would, when freed from verbiage, indicate that Enciso's fame was widely recognized. But we should be more convinced if there had been some specific mention of those *many works*.

Far more indiscriminate in his praise than Lope is Cervantes in his *Viaje del Parnaso*.<sup>4</sup> The forgotten Grub-street hack fares as well at his hands as the worthier writers of whom we

<sup>1</sup> Libro XIX.

<sup>2</sup> *La Filomena*, Epístola VIII.

<sup>3</sup> Libro II.

<sup>4</sup> Capítulo IV.

would gladly know something more than is conveyed in a meaningless generality. Enciso is mentioned by Cervantes in the same breath with two unknown writers, and all three are marked for the *taste* displayed in their works. This praise is sufficiently indefinite to leave room for critical vagaries, though the probability is that Cervantes had in mind Enciso's simple, unrestrained technique, his chastened and mildly-colored style.

Very important is the judgment passed on Enciso in Montalbán's *Para Todos* (1632). Here at last we have the mention of a specific drama together with the admission of its widespread popularity. Montalbán tells us that it is sufficient praise for Enciso to say that he wrote the *Médicis de Florencia*, which had been the model for all great dramas. Through another source<sup>1</sup> we learn that the *Médicis de Florencia* had won renown for Enciso even in Italy, and long after his activity had ceased, toward the close of the 17th century, Francisco de Bances Cándamo<sup>2</sup> calls him the originator of the cloak and sword play, adding that Calderón, Rojas, Rosete, and others merely followed Enciso's lead in that type. This opinion in the face of the fact that Enciso's activity for the stage could not have begun much before 1610, when the cloak and sword play was already flourishing, carries no weight. But it shows that Enciso's name had no feeble echo throughout the 17th century, and that he stood out from among the throng.

To sum up, contemporary opinion gives the work of Enciso appreciative recognition. It does not, however, in view of its somewhat perfunctory character, justify the rank given him by at least one of his contemporaries, the playwright and friend of Lope, Francisco de Medrano. This author, writing in the year 1631, places him on the highest slopes of the Spanish Parnassus. He says that he had felt

<sup>1</sup> Fernando de Vera, *Panegírico por la Poesía*, Montilla (1627).

<sup>2</sup> *Teatro de los Teatros de los pasados y presentes Siglos*, mentioned in appendix to Guyangos' trans. of Ticknor's *History of Spanish Lit.*, vol. II.

his own importance greatly in his youth, until he had learned to prize according to their true worth the works of Lope de Vega, Mira de Amescua, Guillén de Castro, Guevara, Alarcón, Tirso de Molina—the acknowledged masters of the stage—and between Alarcón and Tirso we find the name of Ximénez de Enciso.<sup>1</sup>

## II.

The judgment of contemporaries, however, has furnished no incentive to modern historians of Spanish literature to examine him for themselves, for in most accounts Enciso has had to be contented with very modest attention. Count Schack, to be sure, pays him a splendid tribute, giving him credit for power in character-drawing, and sketching in detail two of his best known plays, *El Príncipe Don Carlos* and *La Mayor Hazaña del Emperador Carlos Quinto*. Ticknor in his history<sup>2</sup> contents himself with a statement of three lines in one place (p. 337), after having in another (p. 319) given the play on which that statement is chiefly based to Montalbán, an error which is retained in all the translations of the work, and which has caused some confusion in the catalogue of the Ticknor Library.<sup>3</sup> Klein's labyrinthian history adds nothing to our previous knowledge. Adolph Schaeffer published in 1887 a German translation of the two plays praised by

<sup>1</sup>*Tomo I de las Obras del Señor Dr. Don Sebastian Francisco de Medrano. en Milán 1631.*

<sup>2</sup>Vol. II, 3d American Edition, Boston, 1866 (2d Period, chs. xx and xxi).

<sup>3</sup>Ticknor's error is due to the fact that he was guided by the twenty-eighth volume of the *Colección de Comedias Nuevas Escogidas* of which his library possesses two copies. In this volume *El Príncipe Don Carlos* is to be found with Juan Pérez de Montalbán given as its author. The confusion may also have arisen from the fact that Montalbán wrote a play with a very similar title, *El Segundo Séneca de España y el Príncipe Don Carlos*. In another volume (*Comedias de Varios Autores*, vol. 28, Huesca, 1634) *El Príncipe Don Carlos* is found properly given to Diego Ximénez de Enciso (sic). Ticknor has crossed out this name and written Montalbán over it.

Schack, and in his history of the Spanish drama (1890), he gives the contents of a number of additional plays by Enciso which had probably been read by no one since the 17th century.

At the present writing Enciso's plays are still in need of being evoked from their tombs in archives and libraries, and of being set out in fair and intelligible order. The existent helps, however, in this enterprise are few. In the first place the facts known about his life are scanty, and the few plays which are attributed to him, less than a dozen in all, are scattered through the libraries of Europe. Occasional copies, though once reported, have disappeared altogether. No playwright of the great age typifies in this respect more thoroughly the fate common to so many among them, namely, that of having his plays disfigured, or published under another name, or of having the greater part of his work go to waste in the glut of stage-production.

Enciso was born in 1585. Nothing is known of him after 1632, when he wrote an extravaganza *Júpiter Vengado*,<sup>1</sup> for a court-festival given in honor of the young prince, Balthasar Carlos. Schack supposes that he was active later in the century on the ground that "his name appears frequently" in the *Colección de Comedias* begun in 1652, which, he says, included with few exceptions only living authors. But in the forty-eight volumes of that collection there are only three dramas by Enciso to be found, and of these, two are identical. Besides, the list of writers includes Lope, Guevara, Mira de Amescua, Tirso, Montalbán, and others who had been dead many a year when the collection was begun. This argument of Schack's might be applied more aptly to an earlier collection begun in 1603. Of this, the twenty-eighth volume was published in 1634 and contained only plays by authors who, with the exception of Enciso, are known to

<sup>1</sup> See *Convocación de las Cortes de Castilla y Juramento del Príncipe nuestro Señor Don Baltasar Carlos, primero deste nombre. Año de 1632, Madrid, 1632*, by Ant. Hurtado de Mendoza.

have been alive at that date. Reasonably Enciso's activity would appear to fall within the period 1610 to 1635.

### III.

In his invaluable catalogue of the Spanish theatre, Cayetano Barrera gives a list of eleven<sup>1</sup> plays by Enciso, but unfortunately does not specify from what sources he compiled the list, nor in what edition each copy was known to exist. The effort of a search for tangible facts concerning their whereabouts is dishearteningly barren of results. Of the eleven dramas mentioned by Barrera, I have been unable to find any trace of *Quien calla otorga*;<sup>2</sup> the *Júpiter Vengado*<sup>3</sup> was never published; six (Nos. 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, and 11 of Barrera's list) exist in scattered copies, but the remaining three, *El Príncipe Don Carlos*, *La Mayor Hazaña del Emperador Carlos Quinto*, and the *Médicis de Florencia*, have in compensation

<sup>1</sup> These eleven plays are: 1. *Los Celos en el Caballo*; 2. *El Encubierto*; 3. *Júpiter Vengado*; 4. *Juan Latino*; 5. *La Mayor Hazaña del Emperador Carlos Quinto*; 6. *El Príncipe Don Carlos*; 7. *Los Médicis de Florencia*; 8. *Quien calla otorga*; 9. *La Santa Margarita*; 10 and 11. *El Valiente Sevillano-Pedro Lobón* (two parts). Mensonero Romanes in his list (vol. II of *Dramáticos Contemporáneos de Lope* in the *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*) mentions a twelfth, *Engañar para reinar*, which, however, belongs to Antonio Enríquez Gómez (? 1600-? 1660). Of these, Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11 are in the National Library of Madrid, some being represented by more than one copy; Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11 are in the British Museum; Nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9 are in the Ticknor Library in Boston; Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7 are in the Royal Library of Berlin; Nos. 5 and 7 are in the National Library of Paris; No. 6 is in the Royal Library of Munich; Nos. 4, 5, and 7 are in the Yale Library, and an old *suelta* of 6 is reported to be in the library of the University of Syracuse. This imperfect list will give an idea of the difficulty of getting at all old copies of existing plays by Enciso. It is to be hoped that some private libraries also will yield something on our subject.

<sup>2</sup> Tirso de Molina's play, *El Castigo del Penséque* has a 2d part with the same title.

<sup>3</sup> It is to be inferred that Barrera never saw a manuscript of *Júpiter Vengado*, since he says nothing about it. I have as yet found no clue to the whereabouts of the play, if it still exists.

come down to us in several editions. To the average student, however, only one of these three, the *Médicis de Florencia*, is available in the *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*. All of Enciso's extant dramas are represented in 17th century editions. In the 18th only three were reprinted, namely, the *Príncipe Don Carlos*, *La Mayor Hazaña del Emperador Carlos Quinto*, and the *Médicis de Florencia*. Of these a number of *sueltas* exist, some of them having evidently been intended for a general collection of plays made about 1745 and printed at Madrid.

What has been said by critics generally concerning the text of plays found in the collections of the 17th century, holds good of those of Enciso. Passages whose meaning has been made uncertain by careless printing occur and discrepancies in different editions show the publishers' perplexity. Verses occasionally lack the requisite number of syllables, and the punctuation is at times placed at random, which not infrequently alters the meaning. The text which is decidedly in the worst condition, is that of the sole copy of the *Encubierto*, in the Ticknor Library. A former owner, in fitting it probably to some collection, trimmed its margins so closely as to cut away on many pages the last word of each verse as well as the last verse of each column. A noticeable difference from the text of plays by other writers lies in the somewhat elaborate stage-directions, which have every appearance of having been added by Enciso's own hand.

#### IV.

If the three plays, *El Príncipe Don Carlos*, the *Carlos Quinto*, and *Los Médicis de Florencia*, which were reprinted in the 18th century, were chosen because they were considered both by contemporaries and the following generation as Enciso's best, modern judgment is likely to concur with such an opinion. Not only do they give us Enciso at his best, but they also secure for him a most individual place among his con-



temporaries. It is a mystery how, with these in mind, Bances Cándamo could credit Enciso with originating the cloak and sword play. These three dramas are as three excellent examples of the true historical drama, or *comedia de cuerpo*, as can be found in Spanish literature, and the cloak and sword element, although not absent, is far from prominent in them. If Bances Cándamo's opinion had any foundation at the time it was uttered, it must be based on dramas which have not come down to us.

Enciso's idea of the historical drama is thoroughly unique for a Spanish playwright and worthy of especial attention, because he alone of all his contemporaries seems to have conceived the historical drama as capable of a close adherence to facts as found in the histories of his own day. Where he distorts events, his source is often more to blame than himself. To be convinced of the great difference between Enciso's conception of a *verdadera historia*, and that entertained by either Lope or Calderón, one need but compare a play like *El Príncipe Don Carlos* with some play of Lope's like *El mejor Alcalde, el Rey* which he admits was taken from the *Crónica de España*, or with Calderón's *Alcalde de Zalamea*. Both of these are called by their authors a *verdadera historia*. Enciso has much the same idea of the historical drama as Shakespeare, both using their sources in a similar way. This drama is not to reflect history slavishly, but may use recognized sources in a way which will give the plot every appearance of probability. The solidity of the whole depends entirely on forceful, well-defined character-drawing. Nor does truth to history in Enciso mean an utter suspension of the imagination, though he seems to have taken warning from the inartistic and conceitful excesses committed by so many of his contemporaries. Even where he deals with characters and plot of his own invention, he is inspired only by the principles of his art and tries to keep all parts in harmony with the spirit of probability which dominates the whole. He is often painstaking to a fault in adhering to his

sources. In his *Príncipe Don Carlos* which, apart from the love-scenes in the under-plot, is based on Cabrera's *Historia de Felipe Segundo*, more than a dozen passages can be pointed out, which are either a verbal transcription from the original or involve only a slight change. This method of procedure, when employed too rigidly, gives some of the utterances of Enciso's characters the uninspired air of a chronicle, as is the case with Charles V's speech at his abdication in the *Carlos Quinto*, and with Philip II's remonstrance to Prince Carlos on his riotous manner of living, in the *Príncipe Don Carlos*. Enciso's strict fidelity to his sources where he deals with characters who have lived, is doubtless due to his vast learning and scholarly temperament. He not only possesses an extended knowledge of the classics, but the contemporary histories of Sandoval, of Antonio Herrera, of Cabrera, the Lives of the Saints, books of travel and tales, all were grist to his mill. That Enciso was inclined to draw his material from many sources is not to be inferred merely from the contents of his plays, but is further substantiated by his own admission, as, for example, when he says at the end of the *Médicis de Florencia*, "the verdadera historia of Alexander as here presented, has been treated by many authors."

## V.

Of these best-known dramas the *Príncipe Don Carlos* stands first. It is one of the unique plays of the Spanish stage. A discussion of it, however, would demand and deserve a paper by itself. Two interesting points may be in order here. First, there exist of this play two versions, one ending with the death of Don Carlos and faithful to the facts of history, the other with a conventional "happy ending" in which the Prince is cured by the miraculous intervention of a saint. Schaeffer, in speaking of these two versions in his history of the Spanish drama, expresses an opinion with which one is loath to agree. He calls the latter (with the happy end-

ing) the original, and gives to some unknown writer the credit for the former and far more perfect version. Yet an examination based solely on a difference of construction, style, and above all on Enciso's idea of historical drama, would reverse Schaeffer's opinion and give the play with the feeble slump to some author other than Enciso. The difficulties of solving this problem are enhanced by reason of the fact that the play with the miraculous and spectacular ending exists in an edition printed in 1634 (the *licencia* is dated April, 1633), while the version which follows Cabrera and the historical facts, exists only in *sueltas* printed in Valencia in 1773. Only the finding of the latter, either in manuscript or in an edition printed before 1634, will allow us to speak with certainty in favor of Enciso. At all events it does not seem improbable that Enciso may have written the historical version shortly after the appearance of Cabrera's *Historia de Felipe Segundo* (1619), that the character of Prince Carlos, as therein represented, scandalized the authorities, and that the play was changed by some unknown hand to soften the harsh lines of the Prince's character. One scene at least, which shows the Prince in his worst light, is supplanted in the spectacular version by a very tame scene in which he is sworn in as heir-apparent to the throne before the assembled Cortes. Is it not reasonable to suppose that this change may have been made on the occasion of the swearing in of Prince Baltasar Carlos (1632), and that the first form of the play was suppressed, lest forgotten stories about Prince Carlos's life and death should be recalled? On the other hand, how unreasonable it is to suppose that any author as late as 1773, two hundred years after the Prince's death, when the real facts about him were of no interest, and only romantic and heroic legends of his career were current, should have felt tempted to rectify the misrepresentations of the version of 1634! Would he be likely at the same time to come upon the forgotten history of Cabrera, and use it with the same care with which Enciso had used it one hundred and fifty years before? Would he not have pub-

lished the revision under his own name rather than Enciso's, which must have been unrecognized at that decadent period of the drama?

The second point of interest is an imitation which the dramatic situations and the splendid delineation of character of *El Príncipe Don Carlos* have inspired. This is the case in Calderón's *La Vida es Sueño*, notably in the second act. Professor Lang has suggested to me that Sigismundo's fit of rage in that play seems to have had as its model a similar scene in the *Príncipe Don Carlos*. I believe one may even go further and find more than a coincidence in the similarity of Calderón's and Enciso's dramas; not only in Sigismundo's fit of rage and his act of throwing a servant out of the window, but in the dialogue between the offended king and his uncontrollable son, in the courting of Rosaura by the Prince and the locking of the door to intimidate his intended victim, in the drawing of his dagger on Clotaldo in disregard of his gray hair, and lastly in his ensuing captivity and remorse, for all of which there are clear parallels in the *Príncipe Don Carlos*.<sup>1</sup> This imitation on the part of Calde-

<sup>1</sup> The following parallels from *La Vida es Sueño* and *El Príncipe Don Carlos* will serve as examples of their occasional similarity.

Calderón.	Enciso.
1.	1.
(Jornada I.)	(Jornada I.)
Basilio: Su madre . . . . . . . . vió que rompía Sus entrañas atrevido Un monstruo en forma de hombre; Y entre su sangre teñido <i>La daba muerte, naciendo</i> <i>Víbora humana del siglo.</i> Llegó de su parto el día; Y los presagios cumplidos, etc.	El Rey: <i>Matasteis á vuestra madre</i> <i>Como vibora naciendo</i> Cuyo alevosa inocencia Fué á España triste por- tento.

rón becomes all the more likely if it be remembered that Enciso's drama appeared only a few years before *La Vida es Sueño* was written, and that its scenic effectiveness no doubt remained in Calderón's mind. Calderón clearly selected just those elements which give to Enciso such marked stage character, that is, his manner of crowning a dramatic development with a *coup de théâtre*.

It has been said by some critics that Montalbán in his play, *El Segundo Séneca de España y el Príncipe Don Carlos*, which has the same plot as that of Enciso of similar title, is only

## 2.

(Jornada II.)

Sigismundo: También oíste decir  
Que *por un balcón*, á  
quien  
Me canse, sabré arrojar.

## 2.\*

(Jornada I.)

Don Carlos: Ni yo disimularé  
Tanta osadía sin que  
Te arroje *por un balcón*.  
Vive Dios, que has de  
volar  
Al foso.

## 3.

Sigismundo: Que un padre que  
contra mí  
Tanto rigor sabe usar,  
Que su condición in-  
grata  
De su lado me desvía,  
Como á una fiera me  
cría,  
Y como á un mons-  
truo me trata,  
Y mi muerte solicita,  
De poca importancia  
fué  
Que los brazos no me  
dé,  
Quando el ser de  
hombre me quita.

## 3.

Don Carlos: ¿Qué debo, qué debo á  
un padre  
Que con tal rigor me  
trata,  
Que fieramente me  
riñe,  
Que injustamente me  
agravia?  
Grande obligación por  
cierto  
Es la forzosa crianza  
De un hijo solo, here-  
dero  
De los Imperios de  
España.  
. . . . .  
¿Qué fiera, qué hombre  
no ama  
Á sus hijos? ¿Quién  
les niega

an imitation of the latter. All that facts permit us to insist on, is that Enciso's play is infinitely better, but that its earliest existing version (that of 1634) is two years later than Montalbán's published in 1632. If the belief, however, that there existed before 1632 a version of Enciso's *El Príncipe Don Carlos* seems plausible after what has already been said, that belief would be further supported by the fact that, from internal evidence, the play of Montalbán seems, in the relative value of parallel passages, a most feeble reflection of Enciso's work.

Sigismundo: ¿Dasme más de lo que es mío?	Don Carlos: Estado, doctrina y casa?
Mi padre eres, y mi Rey;	. . . . .
Luego toda esta grandeza	Si vivo triste, si estoy Desabrido, si me cansa
Me da la naturaleza	Todo, vuestra Majes- tad,
Por derecho de su ley.	Siendo mi padre, es la causa.

4.

4.\*

Sigismundo: (having Rosaura in his power)	Don Carlos: (having Violante in his power)
Hola, dejadnos solos, y esa puerta	Salíos todos allá fuera. (vanse los criados)
Se cierre, y no entre nadie.	. . . . .
(vanse Clarín y los criados)	¿Qué importa si á tu pesar
Rosaura: Yo soy muerta.	Sabré tu fuga estorbar Para poderte rendir?

Violante: ¿Con qué habéis de con-  
seguir

Vuestro intento?

Don Carlos: Con cerrar  
La puerta al cuarto.  
(cierra la puerta)

Violante: ¡Ay, infelice! ¿Qué haré?

5.

5.

(Jornada III.)

Clotaldo: . . . .  
Y no, por verte ya de  
todos dueño,

Duque de Alba: . . . .  
Si me le manda,  
he de ir yo.

## VI.

Enciso's technique is often uneven, his scenes are not always linked well, yet some of them, as units in themselves, are dramatic masterpieces in little. His dramatic quality does not arise from violent language, but merely from placing face to face intense natures, complete opposites in character, each clearly drawn with unsurpassed individuality. With him intense feeling does not depend on a psychological discussion of inner motives—a method foreign to an art whose vitality depends on movement—but constantly bursts its

Clotaldo: Seas cruel, porque quizá es un sueño.	Don Carlos: Mi gusto también es ley,
Sigismundo: Á rabia me provocas, Quando la luz del desengaño tocas.	Y pues el vuestro se arroja
Veré, dándote muer- te,	Contra el mío, yo haré así,
Si es sueño ó si es verdad.	Que no vais.
(al ir a sacar la daga se la detiene Clo- taldo, y se pone de rodillas.)	(saca la daga el Príncipe y al te- nerle el Duque el brazo, se le cae.)
Clotaldo: Yo desta suerte	Duque: ¡ Pobre de mí,
Librar mi vida espero.	Si vuestra Alteza se enoja !

Passages 2\* and 4\* under Enciso are taken from the version published in 1773. Their similarity, however, to the parallels in Calderón again lead one to believe that this version existed before 1634 and that Calderón must have seen it either in manuscript or on the stage. It is difficult to understand how its author should have imitated Calderón, rather than the other way about. In the first place, these scenes belong organically to the plot of *El Príncipe Don Carlos*, as taken partly from Cabrera, partly from traditions about the Prince's actions current in Enciso's day, and *La Vida es Sueño* would have to be dragged in to suppose that it served as a model. Second, since parallels exist between *La Vida es Sueño* and parts common to both versions of *El Príncipe Don Carlos* (Nos. 1, 3, and 5 of above examples), and since in these parallels Enciso was the first on the ground, i. e., before 1633, it seems reasonable to think that in the other parallels, also, the precedence belongs to him.

bounds and resolves itself into immediate action. The way in which he attains this result without departing from simplicity of language is worthy of all praise. The rapidity of action, notably in the *Príncipe Don Carlos*, the *Médicis de Florencia*, and *Los Celos en el Cabello*, logically forbids an unnecessary flow of words or matter foreign to the immediate subject. The nature of his characters is as unaffected as their language, and chiefly so because they are of an unintellectual type and appeal rather to the heart than the head of the public. Enciso can be exquisitely human, even to the extent of being naïve, and his pathos is often affecting in the extreme. With simplicity so marked a quality of his art, it is natural that he should have been a pronounced enemy of the *estilo culto* to which he occasionally alludes with delightful touches of raillery.

Great dramatic effectiveness was not Enciso's only title to appreciation in his day. It is true, he must have appealed especially to his public by putting on the stage characters who had assumed in the imagination of the people a heroic stature, such as Charles V, Philip II, Don Juan of Austria, thus touching the most Castillian of all sentiments, pride of race and national achievement. To one who reads him now, however, there is apparent a very high poetic quality apart from the dramatic frame into which it is cast—at times even, not wholly in harmony with it. At such moments it is the poet of the *dulce lyra*, mentioned by Lope, who speaks. This lyrical intrusion is not frequent, and Enciso cannot be accused of destroying dramatic feeling by making its expression too musical. Its undramatic quality is best illustrated by the *Santa Margarita*, which is rather an effusion of pure poetry than an acting play, and whose religious and spiritual character permits the presence of an undramatic element more than would be warranted in a drama dealing with the facts of human life.



## VII.

In his versification Enciso shows a leaning toward great variety, though seeming especially at his ease in the longer verse of eleven syllables. His preference for rhyme is very marked, as is shown by an extended use of *terza* and *octava rima*, of *redondillas* and, somewhat less frequently, of *quintillas*. The *romance*, used relatively with moderation, finds a more extended application in those dramas which show the greatest maturity in thought and diction, and which probably date from the later period of Enciso's life, that is, about 1630. In the use of all these kinds of metre, Enciso seems to have employed a more or less systematic plan, applying, so far as such a thing is reasonably possible, each kind to the expression of a distinct sort of dramatic feeling. His verse of eleven syllables, relieved at times by the seven-syllabled verse, is, by reason of its greater length and fulness, its larger sonorousness, applied preferably to long expositions in monologue, to serious dialogue, and to dignified dramatic movement, on occasions which require a deeper, sadder tone. The *redondillas* are the metre of action, and are used with a splendid grace and pliancy in sprightly dialogue, where the *quintillas* are also found when greater warmth of feeling is required. The *romance*, apart from its conventional employment in long narrative speeches and dialogues, is occasionally used in the manner of Lope, in dialogue of a lighter, more playful nature.

In the general view of the language, verse, and technique of Enciso just given, the following characteristics have been pointed out as noteworthy: first, the varied nature of his versification, together with the discrimination shown in its use; second, the predominance of rhyme and the relatively moderate use of the *romance* in the majority of his dramas; third, the absence of bombast and flowery metaphor; lastly, an evident indifference to technical excellence in the construction of a play throughout. All this is so much in the spirit

of Lope and his epoch that if we were to start with the hypothesis that Enciso's activity extended into the period dominated by Calderón, we would be obliged on the above evidence to abandon that theory. Especially in the matter of the *romance* it is noteworthy that Enciso's long speeches in that verse-form do not have the perfunctory air about them which so often characterizes them in Calderón. For instance, to the somewhat deliberate demand, "*cuenta como pasó,*" "tell us how it all happened," we find in Calderón the no less deliberate reply, "*fué, Señor, desta manera,*" "this is the way it was,"<sup>1</sup> and a long speech is to be expected. There is no accounting for the growth of a certain form or fad in the drama any more than in social customs of every-day life, and it is difficult to explain how the theatre-going public should have tolerated these long allocutions. The Spaniard of the 17th century must have had the gift of dramatic illusion to an extent which is denied us to-day. When in Calderón's *Príncipe Constante*<sup>2</sup> the king interrupts a speech of over two hundred verses with "*no digas mas,*" the Spaniard's proverbial sense of humor must have been suspended, if he could take in so pat a remark with a stolid countenance. But perhaps two hundred verses were considered a mild affliction, in a time when speeches of nearly four hundred verses<sup>3</sup> were permitted.

From all this, then, it seems probable that Enciso's activity was over when Calderón's influence began to assert itself, that is, by 1635. Whether any more facts about the man and his work will come to light, cannot be known, but may certainly be hoped, if he is given the attention which he merits. He is an interesting figure, thoroughly individual, a man whose work was, as we have seen, prized in his day, and whose influence extended beyond his death.

RUDOLPH SCHWILL.

<sup>1</sup>*La Vida es Sueño*, II, 2.

<sup>2</sup>Act I, 381.

<sup>3</sup>See Tirso's *Del Enemigo el primer Consejo*, I, 81.